



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

EDUCATIONAL NEWS AND EDITORIAL COMMENT

OBSERVATIONS ON THE NEW ORDER IN HIGH SCHOOLS

It ought to hearten any teacher to note the changes which are taking place in our methods of teaching, particularly in the secondary school. The writer has been observing the new order in a high school with which he is well acquainted. Five years ago German was taught to beginners in this school very largely from a grammatical textbook. After two years of instruction, the typical pupil could read a little classical German, but he could not read even this very readily or with genuine enjoyment. But today, in this same high school, pupils are at the outset introduced to spoken German, and they are required to speak it, to read it, and to write it almost from the beginning. They are now about as facile in the use of the language after six weeks of instruction as they formerly were after two years of grammatical drill.

Again, in the high school referred to, civics was taught five years ago mainly from a formal book which dealt with government wholly on the structural side. The divisions of the government, the officers, and their duties, were learned "by heart," and the Constitution was memorized; but very little was gained respecting government as it affected the pupil in his everyday life. However, this year the study of civics has been carried on by having pupils find out at first hand how their own city is governed in all its interests and activities. The pupils are required to go straight to the sources of information and discover how the expenses of government are provided for; how officers are chosen; and so on through a large number of interesting and exceedingly practical problems. Ordinarily, young people are not enthusiastic over the study of civics, but there is a marked change in their attitude in the high school in question this year.

Five years ago the pupils in English classes memorized rhetorical rules, and read over examples in which they were embodied. Occasionally they would write a theme in the attempt to apply the rules which they had learned. Today they are reading entire selections illustrating effective modes of expression, and they are writing a good deal with a view to expressing themselves on familiar subjects in a direct, clear, and pleasing manner. Five years ago algebra was taught as a purely formal, symbolical subject. But now there is considerable improvement, since

pupils are constantly solving practical problems which have a more or less direct bearing upon everyday affairs, though we think still further improvement can be made in regard to this subject.

We might go through with practically all of the subjects taught in this high school and show radical and encouraging reform in the way of employing vital and effective methods of teaching. The aim of making teaching *go to the mark*, in the sense that it will enable the pupil without waste of time or energy to get a subject as it will be of service in real life, is apparently coming to be accepted and generally practiced by teachers in the high school.

M. V. O'SHEA

NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION

The annual conference of the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education was held in Philadelphia December 5, 6, and 7.

The meetings were well attended and gave evidence of an ever-increasing popular interest in the work which this Society is organized to advance. Over three hundred sat down to the banquet at which the chief attraction was an address by Senator Page on Senate Bill No. 3, known as the Page Vocational Bill, which provides federal aid for vocational instruction in agriculture, homemaking, and the industrial arts.

The programs of the several sessions were full and varied, but three phases of the general problem recurred frequently. These were the need of specially trained teachers; the relation of vocational education to the regular school system; and the necessity of state aid in establishing and maintaining vocational schools or departments.

One of the most important events of the conference was the meeting of a special committee to formulate a statement of principles which should govern state legislation relating to vocational education. The membership of this committee was representative of the manufacturing interests, of social organizations, of state and city systems of education and of higher educational institutions.

Incidental to the discussion was the examination of the new bills proposed by Pennsylvania and Indiana. The latter bill is the work of the Indiana Commission on Industrial and Agricultural Education and, if enacted as is confidently expected, it will give Indiana the most comprehensive provisions for education in agriculture and the domestic and industrial arts of any state in the country.

Throughout the discussion it was evident that the most important

of all questions was that relating to the local administration and control of vocational education, and especially as to whether it should be dominated by the educational or the vocational interests. This involved the question whether vocational training should be under the regular boards of education or under boards specially appointed to promote and control such education. The following quotation, from the statement of principles adopted, clearly indicates the conclusions of the committee regarding this important question:

Effective administrative control on the part of the local community of both vocational and general education requires the existence of a local board or committee possessed of ample power to establish and maintain under proper state supervision general and vocational schools. When the existing local administrative authority for general education does not provide for the establishment and promotion of adequate vocational education, legislative provision should exist enabling industrial and other occupational interests, under proper restrictions, to procure the creation of a special board of control for vocational education.

Copies of the complete statement of the Society regarding the principles and policies that should underlie state legislation for a state system of vocational education may be had by applying to Secretary C. A. Prosser, 105 East 22d Street, New York City.

VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE

The organization of a new national society was effected at Philadelphia by a committee appointed during the recent conference on vocational guidance held in New York City. This society will have for its purpose the advancement of vocational guidance. It will work in close co-operation with the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education, until such time as that society may feel disposed to take up this work as a part of its own general purpose. More information regarding this new society will be given later, when its organization has been completed.

FRANK M. LEAVITT

VERMONT DEALING WITH THE GENERAL PROBLEM OF EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATION

The governor of Vermont in a recent message to the legislature recommended a general commission to take up the problems of education in that state. Quoting from his message, the following paragraph sets forth the needs of such an inquiry:

In view of the fact that the superintendents and principals responsible for the direction of the elementary and secondary schools of the state have proposed legislation for the improvement of our common schools, it would seem wise to proceed still farther. Our institutions of higher learning, with each returning biennial session of the general assembly, are requesting larger appropriations for support and maintenance, and it is important that the status of these institutions in relation to the state shall be clearly and speedily established. I therefore recommend that an education commission be created whose duty it shall be to inquire into the subject of public education in Vermont. I further recommend that this commission report at the earliest possible date on the several necessities of the University of Vermont and State Agricultural College, Middlebury College, and Norwich University, with such recommendations as will prevent unnecessary duplication. As soon as possible after making investigation of the institutions of learning, the commission shall recommend, by bill or otherwise, such organizations of the educational and secondary schools of the state in adjustment to the entire educational system of the state as will promote the ends of economy, harmony, and unity.

This message is of interest in connection with one of the notes which was inserted in the last number of the *School Review*. Attention was there drawn to the fact that the state of Iowa has found it necessary to make some readjustments between the state institutions of learning, so that there shall be no conflict and duplication within these various institutions. The state of Vermont evidently finds itself confronted by very similar problems, and is taking at this early date some measures to relieve the probable duplication of work in the various institutions.

The same type of problem that has confronted Iowa and is now confronting Vermont is so common throughout the states of the Union that it will be of interest to note from time to time the methods adopted by the various states to overcome these embarrassing duplications in educational organization.

THE ORGANIZATION OF PERIODS OF STUDY IN HIGH SCHOOL

The township high school in DeKalb, Ill., has adopted a method of dealing with the problem of supervised study within the high school. There are six regular periods of recitations within the school program. The school opens at 8:50 in the morning and closes at 3:25. Between the third and fourth periods in the forenoon, and between the first and last periods of the afternoon program, periods are interpolated which can be used for general purposes and for supervised study. The morning period is devoted to such matters as vocational guidance, general assembly, and other general purposes of the school. The afternoon

period is a study period. On Monday those classes which recite during the first period in the morning go to the rooms where they ordinarily recite during the first period, and there they meet the teachers, who help them study. On Tuesday the classes go to the rooms where they recite during the second period in the morning. Here they have an opportunity to study a different type of lesson from that which they took up on Monday. By distributing these study periods during two successive weeks, each pupil comes in contact with every teacher with whom he has work.

Some method of solving this general problem of high-school study certainly must be worked out. Whether the students shall do the work in the regular class, or shall have an opportunity of the sort which is here described, is a matter of detail of organization. It is hoped that after the experiment has been tried at the DeKalb township high school for some time, the members of the high-school staff may be persuaded to give an account of their experiences. In the meantime other experiments of the sort would be very interesting to all high-school teachers, and it is hoped that the insertion of this note among the general news items may draw out other information of a similar type.

THE NEW YORK INVESTIGATION

The history of the New York Educational Investigation is of more than passing interest to every citizen and especially to every teacher in the country. The inquiry may be said to have originated in a widespread impression that the expenditure of \$27,000,000, which was the amount of the New York school budget when the movement began, and the large increase in this amount which was asked by the Board of Education, needed the most careful scrutiny. There is always ground, apparent or real, for considering the advisability of the reorganization of the school system of a great city. Sometimes supervision seems over-organized and ineffective. Sometimes school opportunities do not seem to be equitably distributed. The people have a right to ask at all times for the evidences of efficiency and for suggestions which will correct existing defects.

It happened in New York that one of the natural avenues for the expression of this demand that school expenditures be scrutinized was the Bureau of Municipal Research. The head of this bureau, Mr. Allen, has figured in the investigation and in the subsequent disagreements to such an extent that he must be recognized in order that the present

situation may be understood. Mr. Allen is a destructive critic of the present school system and of the present superintendent of schools in New York. The resources of the bureau have time and time again been used to give wide publicity, not merely to facts about the New York system, but to adverse conclusions already reached. In short, Mr. Allen has decided that Superintendent Maxwell is incompetent, and means to have this decision accepted if possible.

Mr. Allen succeeded in impressing, among others, Mr. Mitchel, president of the Board of Aldermen of New York, with the result that Mr. Mitchel and his colleagues on the Board of Estimate felt that an inquiry must be made into New York school conditions. The Board of Estimate appointed a committee consisting of Mr. Mitchel, Mr. Prendergast, comptroller of the city, and Mr. Miller, president of the Borough of the Bronx, to organize such an inquiry.

At this point the interesting fact developed that the conduct of an educational inquiry is a complicated matter. The committee consulted with a number of educators in the effort to find out what they ought to do. The present writer may be permitted to contribute his personal experiences. He went to New York on the invitation of Mr. Mitchel. He was taken by Mr. Mitchel's aide to the Bureau of Municipal Research, where the longest and most exhaustive discussion that he had of the expected inquiry was carried on. Afterward he met Mr. Mitchel for a short time and took luncheon with Mr. Mitchel, Mr. Prendergast, Mr. Allen, and one other gentleman whom he has forgotten, but who had no official relation to the inquiry. The impression that the present writer gathered during that visit to New York was that Mr. Allen was a factor in the inquiry more interested and influential than any of the city officials. He gathered the impression that the success of the inquiry was in serious jeopardy because of the influences surrounding it and because of the existing conclusions in the minds of those in contact with the inquiry. He held then and holds now that an inquiry of this type is and ought to be most significant for education. He holds that its methods ought to be scientific and not personal.

The outcome of many conferences of the type to which the writer was introduced was the engagement of Professor Hanus of Harvard to conduct an educational inquiry. Professor Hanus will sooner or later, it is to be hoped, give a frank and full statement of his experiences. It is generally known that as soon as he reached New York he encountered obstacle after obstacle. The mayor called in question the legality of the investigation. The committee of the Board of Estimate demanded that

information be instantly furnished as a basis for criticizing the budget of the Board of Education. The head of the Bureau of Municipal Research expressed in public his dissatisfaction with the methods of the inquiry. In short, confusion was made as confounding as possible. In the meantime Professor Hanus went forward with firmness and with the kind of impersonal candor which brings to him the confidence of educational workers. He gathered some of the best students of education in the country and went about his difficult task. Reports were ultimately written and turned in. These have not yet been published.

Here opens a new chapter. Among the reports was that of Professor Moore of Yale. Professor Moore's report contained, along with other matter, a sharp criticism of the Board of Estimate for interfering with the charter rights of the Board of Education, which is empowered to "have the management and control of the public schools and of the public-school system of the city, subject to the general statutes of the state relating to public-school instruction and to the provisions of this act." It is the contention of Professor Moore that the Board of Education is deprived of its rights through the indirect control assumed by the Board of Estimate and by other municipal agencies. The *Independent* of November 14 contains a full statement by Professor Moore of his position on this and other matters. When Professor Moore's report was read by Mr. Mitchel and his colleagues they were not pleased. They sent to Professor Moore many questions and finally refused to accept or print the report. This brought the report more attention than it could otherwise have hoped to command.

Note some of the types of publicity given to the matter. Here is a letter from Professor Hanus to the editor of the *New York Globe*:

School Editor of "The Globe":

SIR: I have just received a letter from the committee on school inquiry dated October 31, 1912, informing me that the committee has rejected Professor Moore's report. In several New York papers of October 31 and November 1, your paper included, I have read accounts of the report made by the committee on school inquiry to the Board of Estimate and Apportionment. The condemnation in public of Professor Moore's report, in advance of its publication, is as unjust as is the condemnation of the report itself. Professor Moore's report is exceptionally valuable.

If the people of New York City accept the judgment of the committee on school inquiry without insisting that Professor Moore's complete report be allowed to speak for itself in published form, crying evils in the administration of the schools of the city will not be seen in the light in which they should be

seen, and such evils are therefore likely to continue, to the great disadvantage of the city.

The account of a conversation that I had with President Mitchel about Professor Moore's eligibility for the work to which he was assigned is almost pure fiction. I had been told by a close friend of President Mitchel that Professor Moore ought not to have any share in the inquiry because he had "insulted" Mitchel in a conference between them. But when I asked President Mitchel about it and told him that I wished to secure Professor Moore's services, but that I did not wish to take any steps toward doing so if what had been told me were true, President Mitchel said he knew nothing about any insult; and he approved Professor Moore's appointment without qualification.

Further, whether the committee intended to slight us by writing to my associates about their reports instead of to me is immaterial. What I objected to was the attempt of the committee—and that through outside and irresponsible agencies—to edit or revise the report which my associates and I are submitting, as the following quotation from my letter to President Mitchel, dated August 25, 1912, will show:

I note that you say the committee did not intend "to slight" me by writing directly to my associates about their reports. My chief objection to the course you pursued is that it is an attempted editorial revision of the report which as specialist in charge I am making to your committee. Naturally, I object to any editorial revision of the report except my own, including such co-operation of my associates as I need. My revision does not, of course, exclude from consideration such comments of yours as seem to me important.

Very truly yours,

PAUL H. HANUS.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.
November 1, 1912

The Bureau of Municipal Research was interested enough to publish and circulate a folder giving a history of the report, including the following statements:

Early in July the summary of the report was submitted.

July 26, chairman of the school inquiry committee, John Purroy Mitchel, to learn "how exhaustive the investigation was" and "to understand its scope," asked Mr. Moore 18 questions.

July 28, Mr. Moore asked "to have his full report read . . ." before discussing these 18 questions.

August 19, 223 questions were sent to Mr. Moore in a letter which closed, "For the purposes of the committee and the city, your report is wholly valueless as it now lies. It will not be published unless the additional information requested by the committee is furnished, and that promptly."

September 3, Mr. Moore wrote from London that the questions were "irrelevant, immaterial, and intended to confuse the issue. . . ."

October 23, three members of the school inquiry committee wrote to Professor Hanus *inter alia*, "This committee, not the specialists who were employed as its investigators, is responsible to the people of this city for the results of the inquiry, and this committee is not to be expected to accept and make itself responsible for any report, the writer of which withholds from the committee the essential facts on which his conclusions are based and the sources from which these facts were drawn."

October 31, report was made by the school inquiry committee to the full Board of Estimate and Apportionment, explaining that the Moore report was rejected and would not be printed because it lacked supporting facts. "It should be clearly understood that at no time did the committee request any one of the specialists to change any conclusion or recommendation contained in his report. Facts, where lacking, were requested."

The folder then prints the following offer:

For the committee's report address John Purroy Mitchel, chairman, committee on school inquiry, 51 Chambers St. We shall be glad to circulate questions, suggestions, and criticisms from school men and editors bearing upon the general questions of public policy involved in rejecting and refusing to print reports whether by experts or non-experts which do not contain the facts upon which allegations, charges, and recommendations are based.

BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL RESEARCH
261 Broadway, New York

The Public Education Association of the city of New York in its *Bulletin* of November 27 discusses the matter as follows:

We have no brief for Professor Moore or for his report; doubtless two views of it may be entertained, and doubtless also these views will differ according to one's study and experience with the problem of city school administration.

Some presumption should be accorded to the soundness of method and accuracy of result of Professor Moore's work, at least to the extent of giving it a dispassionate consideration. What treatment of this kind it may have received during the period in which it was under discussion between the committee or any agency the committee may have seen fit to employ and Professor Hanus and Professor Moore we cannot completely say, but it is our opinion that an approach to Professor Moore, based on the 223 questions which were addressed to him in one communication, was not calculated to achieve a constructive result. From the point of view of the educational expert these questions were not intended to elicit "facts," but were in the nature of hostile cross-examination, badgering in tone, and sometimes offensive in their implications.

The public cares nothing for the right or wrong on the personal side of the controversy over the Moore report, and that is now regrettable history. But it does very much care for an authoritative appraisal of a school system by the persons who, gathered from the most important educational centers of the country, have been a full twelvemonth minutely scrutinizing the system, and it does not wish to see the results of that scrutiny wasted by conflicts between individuals or official bodies.

We believe the public properly takes the view—as Dr. Hanus and his associates most certainly do—that the Hanus report is to be taken as a unit, and attains its full value only when regarded in that way; that the rejection of any part of it dismembers it, throws the remaining parts out of proportion, and leaves an important field of inquiry untouched. This view is reasonable in itself, but it may be noticed that this sort of inquiry (though never so extensive) has been conducted before, notably in the school systems of England, and that Sir Michael Sadler's reports upon his investigations are in the nature of essays, illuminating technical and abstruse facts to the interested lay public and reaching to the fundamental philosophy of city school systems.

It is to be noted further that Sadler's reports—favorable or unfavorable—were printed by the various municipalities in full as Sadler wrote them.

The last chapter of the matter is as follows: Professor Goodenow of Columbia University and Dr. Fredric C. Howe have been employed to fill out the section of the report for which Professor Moore was originally brought in.

Only one impression can come to the impartial observer. The committee of the Board of Estimate has done its work badly. The committee probably was unfit from the first to deal with the large enterprise which it took up. Prejudice and mismanagement have interfered with the execution of a plan worthy of better control. The inquiry suffers because it was not allowed to follow scientific, objective lines. The demand for inquiries of this type is sure to be heard more and more frequently in the future. New York has shown how such an inquiry ought not to be motivated and controlled. It is to be hoped that some large and influential educational system will get itself examined in a wise and sane way so that the country may see how the work can be done.

C. H. J.

AN EXPERIMENT IN COLLEGE ORGANIZATION

A plan for a new type of college education in the last two years has been worked out by a committee at Columbia University. This plan is described in the report of Dean Keppel. The organizers of this plan do not aim to provide for specialization during these last two years, but are

attempting to bring it about that students shall continue their general education. This general education, furthermore, cannot be secured, it is assumed, under the present arrangement. There must be a new group of courses and there must be an entirely different type of organization of the students' time, from that which is common in the present college course. The following statement of the general plan is given:

Students who are ready to enter the Junior class of Columbia College may elect what has been tentatively christened "The Conference Program." Two years of residence will be necessary for a degree, there being no provision for advanced standing. The course of study is to be arranged, not on departmental lines, but the aim will be to represent among the teachers the principal divisions of knowledge. A certain number of professors have already offered to conduct, in addition to their present programs, one three-hour course continuing through two years. None of these courses is to be elementary, the student being expected to familiarize himself by private study with the elementary parts of the subject not already covered by his previous collegiate work. The student is not to be graded. He may freely enter all courses, and must notify the registrar as to the courses which he plans to offer, with the approval of the instructor, for the degree. Each student is to appear at least twice a year before a conference of all of the instructors of students in the group, and to present, by means of an essay or otherwise, evidence of the progress of his studies.

The sort of program which is here outlined suggests a discussion which has frequently been held in American faculties of the advisability of conducting in American colleges a course somewhat similar to the course which is known in English universities as the "pass course." The "honor" student in an English university is a student who is specializing in a single department or in a limited group of closely related departments. The "pass" student, on the other hand, is supposed to be in pursuit of a general education. He is not subjected to the same rigorous discipline as his fellow-student who is seeking honors. In the Columbia plan, apparently, we have something related to the "pass" plan. There are undoubtedly many students who feel that they would profit by taking a more generalized course. The conflict between the interests of these students and the students who wish to enter one of the professions as soon as possible has long been a notable feature of our American college education.

Again, there is no necessary connection between a general education and the new mode of examining the student and caring for his required attendance on classes and courses. Yet there is a clear justification for the effort to make the student his own guide in the organization of his

curriculum. The experience of Harvard would seem to be a warning against the assumption that even mature college students can be freed from the requirements of regular class attendance. The new Columbia plan will therefore be of double interest to observers because it is an experiment in college administration as well as in subject-matter of instruction.

The development of a plan of this type indicates very strikingly how dissatisfied both college students and college faculties are with some of the features of American college organization. The contrast between mature and immature students ought to be more fully recognized. The problem of specialization has certainly not been solved. In short, experiments in college education are recognized as necessary and desirable.

HIGH-SCHOOL EXTENSION COURSES

The *Los Angeles Tribune* of November 14 prints the following news item:

Literature classes will open at the Los Angeles High School Sunday, November 17, at 3:00 o'clock, as the result of action by the Board of Education, granting permission for the opening of the school on Sunday. For the first time in the history of the city schools, classes will be held on Sunday. The innovation was brought about by the energy of the members of the high-school Social Center Society and the members of the Sunrise Club, an association of young men.

The course of lectures has been arranged for the literature work, and high-school teachers have volunteered their services for the work. C. C. Kelso, director of the social center work, announced the course yesterday.

Sunday, November 17, at 3 P.M.—“The Influence of Music,” by Miss M. Dietrichson, professor of music.

November 24, at 3 P.M.—“Longfellow,” by I. D. Perry, teacher at the Los Angeles High School.

December 1, at 3 P.M.—“Emerson,” Miss Jeanette Pierce, teacher at the Los Angeles High School.

December 8, at 3 P.M.—“Bernard Shaw,” by Miss Nina Updyke, teacher at the Los Angeles High School.